arXiv:1702.03098v1 [q-fin.RM] 10 Feb 2017

Estimation of Risk Contributions with MCMC

Takaaki Koike *and Mihoko Minami †

February 13, 2017

Abstract

Determining risk contributions by unit exposures to portfolio-wide economic capital is an important task in financial risk management. Despite its practical demands, computation of risk contributions is challenging for most risk models because it often requires rare-event simulation. In this paper, we address the problem of estimating risk contributions when the total risk is measured by Value-at-Risk (VaR). We propose a new estimator of VaR contributions, that utilizes Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) method. Unlike the existing estimators, our MCMC-based estimator is computed by samples of conditional loss distribution given the rare event of our interest. MCMC method enables to generate such samples without evaluating the density of total risk. Thanks to these features, our estimator has improved sample-efficiency compared with the crude Monte Carlo method. Moreover, our method is widely applicable to various risk models specified by joint portfolio loss density. In this paper, we show that our MCMC-based estimator has several attractive properties, such as consistency and asymptotic normality. Our numerical experiment also demonstrates that, in various risk models used in practice, our MCMC estimator has smaller bias and MSE compared with these of existing estimators.

Keywords: Quantitative risk management; Value-at-Risk; Economic capital; Risk allocation; risk contributions; VaR contributions; Markov chain Monte Carlo

1 Introduction

In most financial institutions, the risk of their portfolios is measured by *economic capital*. For the purpose of further risk analysis, it is necessary to decompose the portfolio-wide economic capital into the sum of risk contributions by unit exposures. This risk-redistribution process is called *capital allocation*, and the allocated capitals are called *risk contributions* (see, e.g., Dev, 2004). Since it is non-trivial to allocate the economic capital in an economically meaningful way, various principles to determine the risk contributions have been proposed. Among these principles, the *Euler principle* is one of the most well-established rule proposed in Tasche (1999). Its financial justification is given from differing points of view (e.g., by Denault, 2001; Kalkbrener, 2005; Tasche, 1999). Detailed references for rationalizing the use of the Euler principle can also be found in Tasche (2008).

Despite its good economic properties, actual computation of risk contributions poses theoretical and numerical difficulties, especially when the portfolio-wide risk is measured by *Value-at-Risk*

*Center for Mathematics, Graduate School of Science and Technology, Keio University, ⟨takaaki@math.keio.ac.jp⟩

†Department of Mathematical Engineering, Faculty of Science and Technology, Keio University, ⟨mminami@math.keio.ac.jp⟩

(VaR). Although the explicit formula of VaR contributions is derived by Tasche (2001), it can rarely be calculated analytically with a very few exceptions (such as CreditRisk$^+$ studied in Tasche, 2004). Therefore, *Monte Carlo (MC)* method is often used to obtain numerical solution. However, the MC estimator of VaR contributions suffers from significant bias caused by sample-inefficiency and inevitable numerical modification (see, e.g., Yamai and Yoshiba, 2002 for the example). To overcome the difficulties, several methods have been proposed in the literature. Hallerbach (2003) and Tasche and Tibiletti (2004) proposed the approximation formulae by regarding the VaR contributions as the best prediction of losses given the total loss, under some model assumptions. In this paper, we call the estimator derived in such a way the *generalized regression (GR) estimator*. Evaluation of the approximation error caused by the model misspecification is quite difficult. Furthermore, it is also challenging to find a well-fitted model among losses, to accurize the approximation. Glasserman (2005) developed *importance sampling (IS) estimators* in the case of credit portfolios. Although the problem of sample-inefficiency is overcomed in the IS method, risk models where the IS technique are available are quite limited. Consequently, the IS estimator can not be applied to various risk models widely used in practice. Tasche (2009) proposed the *Nadaraya-Watson (NW) estimator* constructed by using kernel estimation method. Although the NW estimator is available to most risk models, incorporation of the importance sampling technique is still indispensable to achieve efficient estimation. Moreover, the asymptotic standard error of the NW estimator can not be computed easily.

In this paper, we propose a new estimator of VaR contributions that utilizes *Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC)* method. Our MCMC-based estimator is available whenever the portfolio loss model is specified by the joint density. This case contains wide varieties of risk models since the joint density can be completely specified for all models having marginal densities and copula density (see, e.g., Yoshiba, 2013 for various examples of this type of models). In this case, the IS technique can hardly be available, and thus the problem of estimating VaR contributions is generally unsettled. We study theoretical properties of our MCMC estimator, and provide a guideline for the efficient application of MCMC to our problem. The proposed estimation method is then carried out within some risk models often used in practice. For these risk models, we compare the performance of the MCMC estimator with the existing estimators.

The MCMC estimator has several attractive properties. First, the MCMC estimator is consistent. Since the MCMC method has an improved sample-efficieny compared with the MC method, we can expect the MCMC estimate to have much smaller bias than that of MC. Second, the MCMC estimator holds asymptotic normality, and its standard error can be consistently estimated by using methods in the theory of Markov chain. Thanks to these features, we can construct approximated confidence interval of the true VaR contributions. Moreover, together with the sample-efficiency of the MCMC method, we can expect that the MCMC estimator has much smaller standard error compared with the existing methods. Finally, the MCMC estimator is free from model-misspecification bias, and can flexibly incorporate the feature of the underlying loss distribution into the estimation. In contrast with the GR estimator, the MCMC estimator does not use any approximation. Therefore, the MCMC estimator is free from the approximation error caused by the model-misspecification. Moreover, by choosing an appropriate proposal distribution of the MCMC, we can directly capture the features of the underlying loss distributions, Thanks to these propertoes, the MCMC estimator can have stably good performance regardless of the underlying risk model.

The key idea behind the MCMC estimator is to generate samples directly from the joint loss distribution given a rare event of interest. This approach is completely different from the crude MC method in which samples are generated from the loss distribution itself. In the MC method, large

portion of samples have to be discarded because VaR contributions depend only on losses given the rare event. Our method, in contrast, does not waste any samples for the estimation. Thanks to this difference, great sample-efficiency can be achieved in the MCMC method. How can we generate samples directly from the conditional density on the rare event? Usually it is quite difficult because our conditional density contains the density of the total loss, which is too cumbersome to compute. Nevertheless, MCMC method enables us to generate their samples directly by sequentially updating the samples, without evaluating the cumbersome term on the total loss.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the mathematical setting of the capital allocation problem, and explains problems for estimating VaR contributions with the existing estimators. Section 3 is devoted to the brief introduction to Markov chain Monte Carlo method. Several families of the proposal distributions are also introduced for efficient use of MCMC. In Section 4, we propose the MCMC estimator, that combines the MCMC method with estimation of VaR contributions to achieve more sample efficiency. Based on the theory of MCMC, we also study some theoretical properties of our MCMC estimator. Numerical results and empirical studies are presented in Section 5. We demonstrate that, for widely used risk models in practice, the MCMC estimator has smaller bias and MSE than those of existing estimators. Through the empirical study, we provide a guideline of incorporating the MCMC method in our framework of estimating VaR contributions. Concluding remarks, future research and potential extensions of the MCMC estimator are summarized in Section 6.

Throughout the paper, integration of vector-valued function is applied componentwise. Let $\mathcal{M}^{r\times c}(E)$ be the set of E-valued $r \times c$ matrices and $\mathcal{M}_+^{r\times c}(E) \subset \mathcal{M}^{r\times c}(E)$ be the set of E-valued positive definite $r\times c$ matrices. For a matrix $M \in \mathcal{M}^{r\times c}(E)$, we write $M^{(i,j)}$ the (i,j)-th component of M for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, r$ and $j = 1, 2, \ldots, c$. For any vector $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, write x_j the j-th component of $\boldsymbol{x}$.

2 Capital Allocation Problem

Throughout the paper, we consider the following portfolio loss model:

$$S = \sum_{j=1}^{d} X_j, \tag{2.1}$$

where $d \geq 3$ is the size of the portfolio, $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_d$ are random variables that represent the losses incurred by the exposures $j = 1, 2, \ldots, d$ within a fixed time period. The random variable S defined in (2.1) stands for the portfolio-wide loss. In this paper, a positive value of loss random variable represents a financial loss, and a negative loss is interpreted as a profit. Let F_j be the cumulative distribution function (cdf) of X_j for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, d$, $F_{\boldsymbol{X}}$ be the joint cdf of the random vector $\boldsymbol{X} = (X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_d)$ and F_S be the cdf of the total loss S. Let C be a copula of $F_{\boldsymbol{X}}$. By Sklar's theorem (see, e.g., Nelsen, 2013), it holds that

$$F_{\boldsymbol{X}}(\boldsymbol{x}) = C(F_1(x_1), \ldots, F_d(x_d)) \tag{2.2}$$

for any $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. This formula allows us to separate the modelling of the individual marginal losses from their dependence structure. See McNeil et al. (2015) for the benefits of this copula modelling approach, and its application in financial risk management.

For the sake of argument, we impose two assumptions on the portfolio loss models (2.1) in this paper. One assumption is $\mathrm{supp}(F_{\boldsymbol{X}}) = \mathbb{R}_+^d$, or $\mathbb{R}^d$, where $\mathrm{supp}(F)$ is the support of a function

F and $\mathbb{R}^d_+ := \{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \boldsymbol{x} \geq 0\}$. The former case focuses on modelling pure losses and the latter on modelling profits and losses (P&L). The other assumption is that, the distributions $F_1, \ldots, F_d, F_{\boldsymbol{X}}, F_S$ and C are all absolutely continuous, i.e. they all have densities $f_1, \ldots, f_d, f_{\boldsymbol{X}}, f_S$ and c, respectively. In other words, we confine ourselves to continuous loss models, and discrete loss models are beyond the scope of this paper. Although typical credit loss models such as the factor models (see, e.g., Bluhm et al, 2016) are excluded, wide variety of loss models are still included in the sphere of our research. Under the assumption of continuity, we have the density-form of the Sklar's formula:

$$f_{\boldsymbol{X}}(\boldsymbol{x}) = c(F_1(x_1), \ldots, F_d(x_d)) \cdot f_1(x_1) \cdots f_d(x_d), \tag{2.3}$$

by differentiating the both sides of (2.2).

As mentioned in Section 1, computing the risk contributions is important in the framework of integrated risk management. In practice, a two-step procedure is conducted for determining the risk contributions. First step is to compute the economic capital $\rho(S)$, where ρ is a so-called risk measure. Risk measure is a map from a loss random variable to a capital buffer that is required to cover the loss with a certain high probability. One of the most popular risk measure is the Value-at-Risk (VaR), defined by

$$\mathrm{VaR}_p(X) = \inf\{x \in \mathbb{R} : \mathbb{P}(X \leq x) \geq p\}, \tag{2.4}$$

where $p \in (0, 1)$ is called the *confidence level*. Second step is to allocate the capital $\rho(S)$ to the individual d-exposures according to some principle. Mathematically, the capital allocation is the problem of determining the vector $(\mathrm{AC}_1, \mathrm{AC}_2, \ldots, \mathrm{AC}_d)$ that satisfies the full allocation property:

$$\rho(S) = \sum_{j=1}^{d} \mathrm{AC}_j. \tag{2.5}$$

The Euler principle solves this problem by utilizing the well-known Euler rule for a function $\boldsymbol{u} \mapsto \rho(\boldsymbol{u}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{X})$:

$$\rho(\boldsymbol{u}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{X}) = \sum_{j=1}^{d} u_j \frac{\partial \rho(\boldsymbol{u}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{X})}{\partial u_j}, \qquad \boldsymbol{u} \in \Lambda \tag{2.6}$$

where $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^d \backslash \{\boldsymbol{0}\}$ is an open set such that $\boldsymbol{1} \in \Lambda$ and ρ is a positive homogeneous risk measure. Define

$$\mathrm{AC}_j^{\rho} := \left. \frac{\partial \rho(\boldsymbol{u}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{X})}{\partial u_j} \right|_{\boldsymbol{u}=\boldsymbol{1}} \qquad j = 1, 2, \ldots, d. \tag{2.7}$$

Then the full alocation property (2.5) holds for this vector $(\mathrm{AC}_1^{\rho}, \ldots, \mathrm{AC}_d^{\rho})$ by taking $\boldsymbol{u} = \boldsymbol{1}$ in the equation (2.6). Since VaR_p is positive homogeneous, the Euler principle can be applied and its solution is given by

$$\mathrm{AC}_j^{\mathrm{VaR}_p} := \left. \frac{\partial \mathrm{VaR}_p(\boldsymbol{u}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{X})}{\partial u_j} \right|_{\boldsymbol{u}=\boldsymbol{1}} = \mathbb{E}[X_j | X_1 + \cdots + X_d = \mathrm{VaR}_p(S)]. \tag{2.8}$$

See Tasche (2001) for deriving the second equality. We call this vector $\mathrm{AC}^{\mathrm{VaR}_p} := (\mathrm{AC}_1^{\mathrm{VaR}_p}, \ldots, \mathrm{AC}_d^{\mathrm{VaR}_p})$ the *VaR contributions*. Since we focus only on this form of allocated capital in this paper, we drop the superscript "VaR_p" and simply denote the VaR contributions by $\mathrm{AC}=(\mathrm{AC}_1, \ldots, \mathrm{AC}_d)$.

Although its good economical properties have been reported in the literature, VaR contributions can not be computed easily. Even when the joint density of the portfolio loss vector $f_{\boldsymbol{X}}$ is analytically specified, theoretical computation of AC is difficult since deriving the joint distribution

of (X_j, S) is challenging in general. A possible numerical method to calculate the VaR contributions is the *Monte Carlo (MC)* method. In the crude MC method, we consider the *pseudo VaR contributions*, defined by

$$\mathrm{AC}_\delta = \mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{X}|\ S \in [\mathrm{VaR}_p(S) - \delta, \mathrm{VaR}_p(S) + \delta]\ ] \tag{2.9}$$

instead of the true AC defined in (2.8), for a sufficiently small $\delta > 0$. Since the probability $\mathbb{P}(S \in [\mathrm{VaR}_p(S) - \delta, \mathrm{VaR}_p(S) + \delta])$ is positive, the right hand side of (2.9) can be written by

$$\mathrm{AC}_\delta = \frac{\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{X} \cdot 1_{[S \in A_\delta]}]}{\mathbb{P}(S \in A_\delta)} \quad \text{where} \quad A_\delta = [\mathrm{VaR}_p(S) - \delta, \mathrm{VaR}_p(S) + \delta]. \tag{2.10}$$

This expression allows us to construct the estimator of the pseudo VaR contributions given by

$$\widehat{\mathrm{AC}}^{\mathrm{MC}}_{\delta,N} = \frac{\frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=1}^N \boldsymbol{X}^{(n)} \cdot 1_{[S^{(n)} \in A_\delta]}}{\frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=1}^N 1_{[S^{(n)} \in A_\delta]}} = \frac{1}{M_{\delta,N}} \sum_{n=1}^N \boldsymbol{X}^{(n)} \cdot 1_{[S^{(n)} \in A_\delta]}, \tag{2.11}$$

where $M_{\delta,N} = \sum_{n=1}^N 1_{[S^{(n)} \in A_\delta]}$, $\boldsymbol{X}^{(1)}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{X}^{(N)} \overset{i.i.d.}{\sim} F_{\boldsymbol{X}}$ and $\{S^{(n)} := X_1^{(n)} + \cdots + X_d^{(n)}\}_{n=1}^N \overset{i.i.d.}{\sim} F_S$. We call (2.11) the *MC estimator*. The MC estimator is used to estimate the true VaR contributions by setting δ and N sufficiently small and large, respectively. Note that this method is available only when $\delta > 0$ since $\mathbb{P}(S \in A_0) = \mathbb{P}(S = \mathrm{VaR}_p(S)) = 0$ by absolute continuity of F_S.

Although we can compute the MC estimator whenever we can generate i.i.d. samples from the joint loss distribution $F_{\boldsymbol{X}}$, it has an inevitable bias to estimate the true VaR contributions. The bias of the MC estimator can be decomposed by

$$\widehat{\mathrm{AC}}^{\mathrm{MC}}_{\delta,N} - AC = b_\delta(N) + b(\delta) \tag{2.12}$$

where $b_\delta(N) = \widehat{\mathrm{AC}}^{\mathrm{MC}}_{\delta,N} - \mathrm{AC}_\delta$ and $b(\delta) = \mathrm{AC}_\delta - \mathrm{AC}$. Because we generally do not know the true AC, the second term $b(\delta)$ can not be computed easily. Therefore, the δ should be as small as possible. However, when the δ is quite small, it is difficult to maintain a sufficient sample size $M_{\delta,N}$ that keeps the first term $b_\delta(N)$ small enough. This is because $\mathbb{E}[M_{\delta,N}] = N \cdot \mathbb{P}(S \in A_\delta)$ and $\mathbb{P}(S \in A_\delta)$ is usually much less than $1 - p$. Due to this trade off relation, the two parts of the bias are difficult to eliminate simultaneously.

To overcome this problem, several estimators have been proposed in the literature. We end up this section by introducing some existing estimators and their problems. Firstly, the *Nadaraya-Watson (NW) kernel estimator* proposed in Tasche (2009) is defined by

$$\widehat{\mathrm{AC}}^{\mathrm{NW}}_{\phi,h,N} = \frac{\sum_{n=1}^N \boldsymbol{X}^{(n)} \cdot \phi\left(\frac{S^{(n)} - \mathrm{VaR}_p(S)}{h}\right)}{\sum_{n=1}^N \phi\left(\frac{S^{(n)} - \mathrm{VaR}_p(S)}{h}\right)}, \tag{2.13}$$

where ϕ is the kernel density and $h > 0$ is the bandwidh. Since this estimator is a slight modification of the MC estimator (2.11), it has the same problem as the MC estimator explained above. Moreover, the bias and the standard error of the NW estimator (see, e.g. Hansen, 2009 for their expressions) can not be computed easily because it requires the evaluation of the total loss density $f_S(\mathrm{VaR}_p(S))$. Secondly, Glasserman (2005) developed the *importance sampling (IS) estimators* to overcome the problem of sample-inefficiency. By using the IS technique to increase samples whose sums belong to A_δ, the bias of the IS estimators can be sufficiently small. However, risk models that can utilize this IS technique is limited to specific credit risk models (see, e.g., Huang

et al, 2007 ; Mausser and Rosen, 2008). Unfortunately, the IS estimators are hardly available in our case, where the loss model (2.1) has a joint loss density as specified in (2.3). Finallly, Hallerbach (2003) and Tasche and Tibiletti (2004) constructed estimators by supposing a generalized regression model among the losses:

$$\boldsymbol{X} = g_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(S) + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \tag{2.14}$$

where $g_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(s)$ is a function parametrized by $\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^q$ and $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ is an error random vector such that $\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}|S = \mathrm{VaR}_p(S)] = \mathbf{0}$. Let $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_N$ be an estimator of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$. Then we call the following form of the estimator

$$\widehat{\mathrm{AC}}^{\mathrm{GR}}_{g_{\boldsymbol{\beta}},N} := g_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_N}(\mathrm{VaR}_p(S)) \tag{2.15}$$

the *generalized regression (GR) estimator*. Although this estimator is intuitive and easy to apply, it also has an inevitable bias. Let g be the true function such that $\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{X}|S = v] = g(v)$ and let $\boldsymbol{\beta}^*$ be the minimizer of the error term $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ in some sense. If $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_N$ goes to $\boldsymbol{\beta}^*$ as $N \to +\infty$, the bias of the GR estimator can be decomposed by

$$\widehat{\mathrm{AC}}^{\mathrm{GR}}_{g_{\boldsymbol{\beta}},N} - AC = b(N) + b(g_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}), \tag{2.16}$$

where $b(N) = g_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_N}(\mathrm{VaR}_p(S)) - g_{\boldsymbol{\beta}^*}(\mathrm{VaR}_p(S))$ and $b(g_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = g_{\boldsymbol{\beta}^*}(\mathrm{VaR}_p(S)) - g(\mathrm{VaR}_p(S))$. The first term $b(N)$ is caused by the estimation error and the second term $b(g_{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ is by the misspecification of the model (2.14). Since we do not know the true function g in general, the second term $b(g_{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ is difficult to evaluate. To avoid the model-misspecification, we have to choose the family of functions $\{g_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} : \boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^q\}$ large enough to contain g. On the other hand, estimating the parameter $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is not as easy as in the ordinary regression model. Since we usually do not have samples from $F_{\boldsymbol{X}|S=\mathrm{VaR}_p(S)}$, it is non-trivial to estimate $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ by minimizing the error term $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ given $\{S = \mathrm{VaR}_p(S)\}$. Due to these obstacles, it is generally difficult to evaluate the bias of the GR estimator. A notable exception is the case when the risk model $\boldsymbol{X}$ follows an elliptical distribution. In this case, it holds that (e.g., Corollary 8.43 in McNeil et al., 2015)

$$\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{X}|S = \mathrm{VaR}_p(S)] - \mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{X}] = \frac{\mathrm{Cov}(\boldsymbol{X}, S)}{\mathrm{Var}(S)} \cdot (\mathrm{VaR}_p(S) - \mathbb{E}[S]). \tag{2.17}$$

Therefore, the true VaR contributions are provided when we choose $g_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(x) = \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + \boldsymbol{\beta}_1 x$ and

$$\boldsymbol{\beta}_0^* = \mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{X}] - \frac{\mathrm{Cov}(\boldsymbol{X}, S)}{\mathrm{Var}(S)} \cdot \mathbb{E}[S] \qquad \boldsymbol{\beta}_1^* = \frac{\mathrm{Cov}(\boldsymbol{X}, S)}{\mathrm{Var}(S)}. \tag{2.18}$$

Since this $\boldsymbol{\beta}^*$ is the minimizer of $\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^2] = \mathbb{E}[(\boldsymbol{X} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_1 S)^2]$, the ordinary least squares (OLS) estimator $\boldsymbol{\beta}_N^{\mathrm{OLS}}$ converges to $\boldsymbol{\beta}^*$ as N goes to infinity. As a consequence, the second term $b(g_{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ is zero and the first term $b(N)$ can be eliminated by taking N sufficiently large.

3 General theory of MCMC

Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) is a method to generate samples from a probability distribution by constructing a Markov chain whose stationary distribution is the desired one. By allowing Markovian type dependence within the samples, MCMC enables to simulate wide variety of distributions even if they can not be simulated directly in practice. In this section, we briefly introduce the theory of MCMC method. We review consistency and asymptotic normality of estimators computed by Markov chain. To obtain an efficient estimator, it is important to choose an

appropriate proposal distribution on generating sample path of the Markov chain. In Section 3.2, we summarize the family of proposal distributions used in this paper.

3.1 Brief introduction to MCMC

Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a set and $\mathcal{E}$ be a σ-algebra of subsets of E. *Markov chain* is a sequence of E-valued random variables $(\boldsymbol{X}^{(1)}, \boldsymbol{X}^{(2)}, \dots)$ satisfying the Markov property;

$$\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{X}^{(n+1)} \in A | \boldsymbol{X}^{(k)} = \boldsymbol{x}^{(k)}, k \leq n) = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{X}^{(n+1)} \in A | \boldsymbol{X}^{(n)} = \boldsymbol{x}^{(n)}), \tag{3.1}$$

for all $n \geq 1$, $A \in \mathcal{E}$, and $\boldsymbol{x}^{(1)}, \dots, \boldsymbol{x}^{(n)} \in E$. Markov chain is characterized by its stochastic kernel $P : E \times \mathcal{E} \to \mathbb{R}_+$, given by $\boldsymbol{x} \times A \mapsto P(\boldsymbol{x}, A) := \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{X}^{(n+1)} \in A | \boldsymbol{X}^{(n)} = \boldsymbol{x})$. If there exists a probability distribution π such that $\pi(A) = \int \pi(\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}) P(\boldsymbol{x}, A)$ for all $\boldsymbol{x} \in E$ and $A \in \mathcal{E}$, then the π is called the *stationary distribution*. See, e.g., Nummelin (2004) for general theory of Markov chain.

Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) is a widely used statistical method for simulating probability distribution by generating Markov chain. MCMC is often used to estimate the quantity

$$\pi(h) := \int h(\boldsymbol{x}) \pi(\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}), \tag{3.2}$$

for some distribution π and a π-measurable function h. Its MCMC estimator is given by

$$\hat{\pi}_N(h) := \frac{1}{N} \left(h(\boldsymbol{X}^{(1)}) + \cdots + h(\boldsymbol{X}^{(N)}) \right), \tag{3.3}$$

where $(\boldsymbol{X}^{(1)}, \dots, \boldsymbol{X}^{(N)})$ is an N-path of the Markov chain whose stationary distribution is π. In the framework of MCMC, we call this π the *target distribution*. Since the target distribution π is externally determined by the problem to solve, the problem of MCMC is to find the stochastic kernel P such that it has the stationary distribution π. Additionally, we require P that its sample path can be generated easily.

One of the most popular stochastic kernel used in practice is the *Metropolis-Hastings* (MH) kernel (Metropolis et al., 1953; Hastings, 1970), defined by

$$P(\boldsymbol{x}, \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{y}) = p(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{y} + r(\boldsymbol{x}) \delta_{\boldsymbol{x}}(\boldsymbol{y}), \tag{3.4}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
p(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) &= q(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) \alpha(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}), \\
\alpha(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) &= \begin{cases} \min \left[\frac{\pi(\boldsymbol{y}) q(\boldsymbol{y}, \boldsymbol{x})}{\pi(\boldsymbol{x}) q(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y})}, \ 1 \right] & \text{if } \pi(\boldsymbol{x}) q(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) > 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases} \\
r(\boldsymbol{x}) &= 1 - \int p(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{y},
\end{aligned}$$

$\delta_{\boldsymbol{x}}$ is the Dirac delta function, and $q : E \times E \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is a function such that $\boldsymbol{x} \mapsto q(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y})$ is a measurable function for all $\boldsymbol{y} \in E$, and $\boldsymbol{y} \mapsto q(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y})$ is a probability density function (pdf) for all $\boldsymbol{x} \in E$. This function q is called a *proposal distribution*. It can be shown that the MH kernel has a stationary distribution π (Tierney, 1994). The great popularity of the MH kernel comes from the fact that, we can easily generate sample path of the corresponding Markov chain by using the

so-called *MH algorithm* (see e.g., Chib and Greenberg, 1995 for the simple and intuitive exposition of the algorithm). Under the mild conditions that (i) a vector $\boldsymbol{x}^{(1)} \in \mathrm{supp}(\pi)$ is known, (ii) samples from $q(\boldsymbol{x}, \cdot)$ can be generated for all $\boldsymbol{x} \in E$, and (iii) the ratio $\pi(\boldsymbol{y})/\pi(\boldsymbol{x})$ can be calculated for all $\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y} \in E$, we can generate N-sample path of the desired Markov chain by the following algorithm:

Algorithm 1: MH Algorithm

1. Set $N > 0$, q: proposal distribution, and $\boldsymbol{X}^{(1)} = \boldsymbol{x}^{(1)} \in \mathrm{supp}(\pi)$
2. **For** $n = 1, 2, \ldots, N$,
3. Generate $\boldsymbol{X}_*^{(n)} \sim q(\boldsymbol{X}^{(n)}, \cdot\,)$ and $U \sim \mathcal{U}(0,1)$
4. Set
$$\alpha_n := \alpha(\boldsymbol{X}^{(n)}, \boldsymbol{X}_*^{(n)}) = \min\left[\frac{\pi(\boldsymbol{X}_*^{(n)})}{\pi(\boldsymbol{X}^{(n)})} \cdot \frac{q(\boldsymbol{X}_*^{(n)}, \boldsymbol{X}^{(n)})}{q(\boldsymbol{X}^{(n)}, \boldsymbol{X}_*^{(n)})},\ \ 1 \right] \tag{3.5}$$
5. Set
$$\boldsymbol{X}^{(n+1)} := 1_{[U \le \alpha_n]} \cdot \boldsymbol{X}_*^{(n)} + 1_{[U > \alpha_n]} \cdot \boldsymbol{X}^{(n)} \tag{3.6}$$
6. **End for**
7. Return $(\boldsymbol{X}^{(1)}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{X}^{(N)})$ as an N-sample path of the Markov chain with the kernel (3.4) and the initial value $\boldsymbol{X}^{(1)} = \boldsymbol{x}^{(1)}$

We call $\alpha_n := \alpha(\boldsymbol{X}^{(n)}, \boldsymbol{X}_*^{(n)})$ in (3.5) the *acceptance probability* at n-th iteration. Based on the N-sample path $(\boldsymbol{X}^{(1)}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{X}^{(N)})$ generated in Algorithm 1, we can compute the MCMC estimator $\hat{\pi}_N(h)$ given by (3.3).

The MCMC estimator $\hat{\pi}_N(h)$ has several attractive properties such as consistency and asymptotic normality. Firstly, the MCMC estimator is consistent (see, e.g., Theorem 1 in Nummelin ;2002), i.e.,

$$\lim_{N \to +\infty} \hat{\pi}_N(h) = \pi(h) \qquad \text{with probability 1,} \tag{3.7}$$

for all π-integrable functions h and all initial state $\boldsymbol{X}^{(1)} = \boldsymbol{x}^{(n)} \in \mathrm{supp}(\pi)$. Moreover, *Central Limit Theorem* (CLT) holds under some regularity conditions (see, e.g., Chapter 17 in Meyn and Tweedie, 2012), i.e.,

$$\sqrt{N}\ (\ \hat{\pi}_N(h) - \pi(h)\ ) \ \xrightarrow{d}\ \mathcal{N}_d(0, \Sigma_h) \qquad \text{as} \quad N \to +\infty, \tag{3.8}$$

where

$$\Sigma_h := \mathrm{Var}_\pi[\ h(\boldsymbol{X}^{(1)})\ ] + 2\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathrm{Cov}_\pi[\ h(\boldsymbol{X}^{(1)}), h(\boldsymbol{X}^{(1+k)})\ ] \qquad \in (0, \infty). \tag{3.9}$$

Since we can rarely compute the asymptotic variance (3.9) in real situation, we have to estimate it from the same sample path $(\boldsymbol{X}^{(1)}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{X}^{(N)})$ that we used to compute $\hat{\pi}_N(h)$. One simple and popular estimator of Σ_h is the so-called *batch means estimator* (see, e.g., Geyer, 2012). For the N-path of the Markov chain $(\boldsymbol{X}^{(1)}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{X}^{(N)})$, the batch means estimator $\hat{\Sigma}_{h,N}$ is defined by

$$\hat{\Sigma}_{h,N} = \frac{L_N}{B_N - 1} \sum_{b=1}^{B_N} (\ \hat{\pi}_{N,b}(h) - \hat{\pi}_N(h)\ )^{\mathrm{T}}\ (\ \hat{\pi}_{N,b}(h) - \hat{\pi}_N(h)\ ), \tag{3.10}$$

where L_N, B_N are positive integers satisfying $N = L_N \cdot B_N$, and

$$\hat{\pi}_{N,b}(h) = \frac{1}{L_N} \sum_{l=(b-1)L_N}^{bL_N - 1} h(\boldsymbol{X}^{(l)}) \qquad \text{for} \quad b = 1, 2, \ldots, B_N. \tag{3.11}$$

L_N is called the batch length and B_N is the number of batches. Under some regularity conditions, the batch means estimator $\hat{\Sigma}_{h,N}$ converges to Σ_h with probability 1 as $N \to +\infty$ (see, e.g., Jones et al., 2006; Vats et al., 2015). By using the asymptotic relation (3.8) and the consistency of the batch means estimator $\hat{\Sigma}_{h,N}$, we can construct an approximate 95% confidence interval of the true quantity $\pi(h)$, given by

$$\hat{\pi}_N(h) - 1.96 \cdot \frac{\hat{\sigma}_{h,N}}{\sqrt{N}} < \pi(h) < \hat{\pi}_N(h) + 1.96 \cdot \frac{\hat{\sigma}_{h,N}}{\sqrt{N}}, \tag{3.12}$$

where $\hat{\sigma}_{h,N} = (\hat{\Sigma}_{h,N}^{(j,j)}, j = 1, 2, \ldots, d)$.

3.2 Choice of the proposal distribution

When implementing the MCMC, an appropriate choice of the proposal function q is necessary. When choosing q, it is desirable that the Markov chain characterized by (3.4) theoretically holds the *Central limit theorem* (3.8), and also, its asymptotic variance (3.9) is as small as possible. Since the asymptotic variance Σ_h can rarely be calculated explicitly in real situation, we usually rely on post-implementation review, i.e. evaluating the goodness of the selected proposal distribution after performing the MCMC. In this section, we introduce two empirical methods for checking validity of the proposal selection. We also provide some families of the proposal distributions for an appropriate choice of q. Theoretical verification of CLT will be carried over into Section 4.3.

In practice, there are two prevalent methods to check the validity of the proposal distribution (see, e.g., Geyer, 2012 in details). One method is to check that the *autocorrelation plots* of the marginal sample paths steadily decline . For an N-sample path $(\boldsymbol{X}^{(1)}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{X}^{(N)})$ and the MCMC estimator $\hat{\pi}_N(h) = (\hat{\pi}_{N,1}(h), \ldots, \hat{\pi}_{N,d}(h))$, we draw plots of the sample autocorrelations $\hat{r}_j(h) := \hat{R}_j(h)/\hat{R}_j(0)$, where

$$\hat{R}_j(h) := \frac{1}{N-k} \sum_{n=1}^{N-k} (h_j(X_j^{(n)}) - \hat{\pi}_{N,j}(h)) \cdot (h_j(X_j^{(n+k)}) - \hat{\pi}_{N,j}(h)), \tag{3.13}$$

versus the time lag $k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$, for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, d$. We can expect that the asymptotic variance Σ_h should be small if the autocorrelation plots steadily decline to zero as the lag increases. The other method is to check the *acceptance rate*, i.e. the percentage of times a candidate is accepted. In general, extremely low acceptance rate implies that the chain tends to be stuck to one point. Conversely, extremely high acceptance rate occurs when the chain moves only around the mode of the target density and does not traverse the entire support (Chib and Greenberg, 1995). The first situation yields high asymptotic variance, and the second gives an illusionally low asymptotic variance. To avoid such situations, it is important to check that the acceptance rate takes a moderate value.

Typically, proposal distribution q is selected from a certain class of distributions. To find a suitable q, several classes are in order. First, if $q(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) = f(\boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{x})$ for some pdf f, then the candidate $\boldsymbol{X}_*$ is drawn according to the process

$$\boldsymbol{X}_* = \boldsymbol{X} + \boldsymbol{Z}, \qquad \text{where} \quad \boldsymbol{Z} \sim f, \tag{3.14}$$

and $\boldsymbol{X}$ is the current state. We call this q the *random walk* proposal distribution. In the case when f is symmpetric around the origin, the acceptance probability (3.5) is given simply by $\alpha(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) = \min[\frac{\pi(\boldsymbol{y})}{\pi(\boldsymbol{x})}, 1]$. Second, when $q(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) = f(\boldsymbol{y})$ for some pdf f, then the candidate $\boldsymbol{X}_*$ is

updated by

$$\boldsymbol{X}_* = \boldsymbol{Z}, \qquad \text{where} \quad \boldsymbol{Z} \sim f. \tag{3.15}$$

Since the candidate is drawn independently of the current position, this q is called the *independent* proposal distribution. The two proposal distributions, the random walk and the independent proposals, are widely used due to their simplicity. However, these proposal distributions often fail to perform well when the target distribution π is heavy-tailed. To overcome this problem, we finally introduce the *mixed preconditioned Crank-Nicolson (MpCN)* proposal distribution (proposed by Kamatani, 2014). This proposal distribution updates the candidate according to the following process:

$$\boldsymbol{X}_* = \boldsymbol{\mu} + \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot (\boldsymbol{X} - \boldsymbol{\mu}) + (1-\rho)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot Z^{-\frac{1}{2}} \cdot \boldsymbol{W}, \tag{3.16}$$

where Z follows the gamma distribution with shape parameter $d/2$ and the scale parameter $||\Sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\boldsymbol{X} - \boldsymbol{\mu})||^2/2$ for $\boldsymbol{\mu} := \mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{X}]$ and $\Sigma := \mathrm{Var}[\boldsymbol{X}]$, and $\boldsymbol{W} \sim \mathcal{N}_d(\boldsymbol{0}, \Sigma)$. Note that, here we introduce the standardized version of the original MpCN in Kamatani (2014). The acceptance probability (3.5) can be written by

$$\alpha(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{X}_*) = \left[\frac{\pi(\boldsymbol{X}_*)}{\pi(\boldsymbol{X})} \cdot \left(\frac{||\Sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\boldsymbol{X} - \boldsymbol{\mu})||}{||\Sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\boldsymbol{X}_* - \boldsymbol{\mu})||} \right)^{-d}, \ 1 \right]. \tag{3.17}$$

The major difference of this proposal distribution from the first two simple ones is that, not only the mean but also the variance of the candidate changes with the current state $\boldsymbol{X}$. Since the MpCN proposal distribution admits larger jumps in the tail, we can expect better acceptance rate even when π is heavy-tailed (see, e.g., Livingstone, 2015 for such position-dependent proposal distributions).

4 Proposed method

We have shown that estimators constructed by MCMC has several attractive properties, such as consistency and asymptotic normality. In this section, we propose a new estimator of VaR contributions, that utilizes MCMC method to achieve efficient estimation, We also show consistency and asymptotic normality of our MCMC-based estimator under a certain class of risk models.

4.1 The set-up

We suppose the following situation: we have an explicit form of the joint loss density $f_{\boldsymbol{X}}$, and thus, we can compute the quantity $f_{\boldsymbol{X}}(\boldsymbol{x})$ for any $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. We also can generate i.i.d. samples $\boldsymbol{X}^{(1)}, \dots, \boldsymbol{X}^{(N)}$ from $F_{\boldsymbol{X}}$ up to sufficiently large N. Then, the i.i.d. samples $S^{(1)}, \dots, S^{(N)}$ from F_S can be generated by taking $S^{(n)} = X_1^{(n)} + \cdots + X_d^{(n)}$ for $n = 1, 2, \dots, N$. On the other hand, suppose that we have neither an explicit form of the total loss density f_S nor the way to compute the quantity $f_S(s)$ for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$. The situation described above typically occurs when we model the joint loss density $f_{\boldsymbol{X}}$ by the copula approach, i.e. specifying the marginal loss densities $f_1, f_2, \dots, f_d$ and then specifying the copula density c. When we use this approach, the resulting joint loss density $f_{\boldsymbol{X}}$ is speficied by the formula (2.3).

Under the situation above, a two-step procedure (see, e.g., Glasserman, 2005) is conducted for computing the VaR contributions (2.8). The first step is to estimate $\mathrm{VaR}_p(S)$ and the second step is to estimate the VaR contributions $\mathrm{AC}= \mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{X}|S = \mathrm{VaR}_p(S)]$ with the $\mathrm{VaR}_p(S)$ replaced by the estimated one in the first step. Estimation of the $\mathrm{VaR}_p(S)$ in the first step is conducted

by Monte Carlo simulation. Based on the i.i.d. samples $S^{(1)}, \dots, S^{(N)}$ from F_S, the estimator of $\mathrm{VaR}_p(S)$ is given by $\widehat{\mathrm{VaR}}_p(S) = S^{[Np]}$, where $S^{[Np]}$ is the Np-th largest sample among N samples $\{S^{(1)}, \dots, S^{(N)}\}$. Hereafter we refer to the estimate of $\widehat{\mathrm{VaR}}_p(S)$ as v in short, and regard it as a constant. In the second step, we aim at estimating $\mathrm{AC}= \mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{X}|S = v]$. According to the crude Monte Carlo method as explained in Section 2, the VaR contributions are estimated by

$$\widehat{\mathrm{AC}}^{\mathrm{MC}}_{\delta,N} = \frac{1}{M_{\delta,N}} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \boldsymbol{X}^{(n)} \cdot 1_{[S^{(n)} \in A_\delta]}, \tag{4.1}$$

where $\boldsymbol{X}^{(1)}, \dots, \boldsymbol{X}^{(N)} \overset{i.i.d.}{\sim} F_{\boldsymbol{X}}$, $S^{(n)} := X_1^{(n)} + \cdots + X_d^{(n)}$ for $n = 1, \dots, N$, $A_\delta = [v - \delta, v + \delta]$ and $M_{\delta,N} = \sum_{n=1}^{N} 1_{[S^{(n)} \in A_\delta]}$.

As explained in Section 2, the problem of this two-step procedure is that the estimator of VaR contributions in the second step often has a significant bias. To address this issue, we develop a Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC)-based estimator, that achieves sample efficiency and consistency, by utilizing the MCMC method. The major difference of our MCMC-based estimator from the MC one is that, samples are generated not from the loss distribution $F_{\boldsymbol{X}}$ itself, but from the conditional distribution of $\boldsymbol{X}$ given the sum constraint $\{S = v\}$. Although it is almost impossible in the MC method, the MCMC enables us to realize it.

4.2 The MCMC estimator

We start to describe the MCMC-based estimator with reformulating the problem of computing VaR contributions. Let $\boldsymbol{X}' = (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_{d'})$, where $d' = d - 1$. By the full allocation property (2.5), we have that

$$\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{X}|S = v] = (\ \mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{X}'|S = v],\ v - \mathbf{1}_{d'}^{\mathrm{T}} \cdot \mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{X}'|S = v]\ )^{\mathrm{T}}, \tag{4.2}$$

where $S = X_1 + \cdots + X_d$. Therefore, computation of the VaR contributions $\mathrm{AC}=\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{X}|S = v]$ can be reduced to estimate the VaR contributions of the d'-subportfolio, given by $\mathrm{AC}' = \mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{X}'|S = v]$. In our method, we estimate this quantity AC' by generating samples directly from $F_{\boldsymbol{X}'|S=v}$. The conditional joint density of $\boldsymbol{X}'$ given $\{S = v\}$ can be written by

$$f_{\boldsymbol{X}'|S=v}(\boldsymbol{x}') = \frac{f_{\boldsymbol{X}',S}(\boldsymbol{x}', v)}{f_S(v)} = \frac{f_{\boldsymbol{X}}(\boldsymbol{x}', v - \mathbf{1}_{d'}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{x}')}{f_S(v)}, \qquad \boldsymbol{x}' \in \mathbb{R}^{d'} \tag{4.3}$$

where the second equation follows from a linear transformation $(\boldsymbol{X}', S) \mapsto \boldsymbol{X}$. Since it is difficult to evaluate the total loss density $f_S(v)$, we can hardly generate samples directly from $f_{\boldsymbol{X}'|S=v}$.

By taking $E = \mathbb{R}^{d'}$, $h(\boldsymbol{x}) = \boldsymbol{x}$ and $\pi(\boldsymbol{x}) = f_{\boldsymbol{X}'|S=v}(\boldsymbol{x})$ on the discussion in Section 3, our problem of estimating VaR contributions can be reduced to estimate $\pi(h) = \mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{X}'|S = v]$ in (3.2) by MCMC. Even though we can hardly compute $f_{\boldsymbol{X}'|S=v}$ itself, we can compute the acceptance probability (3.5), given by

$$\alpha(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) = \min\left[\frac{f_{\boldsymbol{X}'|S=v}(\boldsymbol{y}) \cdot q(\boldsymbol{y}, \boldsymbol{x})}{f_{\boldsymbol{X}'|S=v}(\boldsymbol{x}) \cdot q(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y})},\ 1\right] = \min\left[\frac{f_{\boldsymbol{X}}(\boldsymbol{y}, v - \mathbf{1}_{d'}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{y}) \cdot q(\boldsymbol{y}, \boldsymbol{x})}{f_{\boldsymbol{X}}(\boldsymbol{x}, v - \mathbf{1}_{d'}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{x}) \cdot q(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y})},\ 1\right] \tag{4.4}$$

for all $\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}$. Note that the cumbersome term $f_S(v)$ disappears by taking the ratio of $f_{\boldsymbol{X}'|S=v}(\boldsymbol{y})$ to $f_{\boldsymbol{X}'|S=v}(\boldsymbol{x})$. Therefore, under some appropriate choice of the proposal function q, we can generate N-sample path of the Markov chain whose stationary distribution is $\pi(\boldsymbol{x}) = f_{\boldsymbol{X}'|S=v}(\boldsymbol{x})$. Based on the sample path of the Markov chain, we can construct the MCMC estimator $\hat{\pi}_N(h)$ defined by

(3.3). Its consistency follows directly from the general theory of Markov chain presented in Section 3. The algorithm to compute the MCMC estimator of VaR contributions is summarized as follows:

Algorithm 2: MCMC estimator of VaR contributions $\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{X}|S = \mathbf{VaR}_p(S)]$

1. Set $v > 0$, $N > 0$, q: proposal distribution, and $\boldsymbol{X}^{(1)} = \boldsymbol{x}^{(1)} \in \mathrm{supp}(\pi)$.
2. Perform Algorithm 1 for the given N, q, and $\boldsymbol{x}^{(1)}$ to generate an N-sample path $(\boldsymbol{X}'^{(1)}, \dots, \boldsymbol{X}'^{(N)})$ of a Markov chain whose stationary distribution is $f_{\boldsymbol{X}'|S=v}$.
3. Define
$$\boldsymbol{X}^{(n)} := (\boldsymbol{X}'^{(n)}, v - \mathbf{1}_{d'}^{\mathrm{T}} \boldsymbol{X}'^{(n)})^{\mathrm{T}}, \tag{4.5}$$
and set
$$\widehat{\mathrm{AC}}_{q,N}^{\mathrm{MCMC}} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \boldsymbol{X}^{(n)} \tag{4.6}$$
to estimate VaR contributions $\mathrm{AC} = \mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{X}|S = v]$.

4.3 Some theoretical results

In this section, we provide some theoretical results to verify asymptotic normality of the MCMC estimator (4.6). We will see that CLT holds for various risk models when we model the pure losses. On the other hand, when we model the profits & losses, theoretical justification of CLT is challenging except for some special cases. We provide an example of justifying CLT only when we model P&L by some elliptical distribution.

When we model pure losses, i.e. $\mathrm{supp}(F_{\boldsymbol{X}}) = \mathbb{R}_+^d$, then the conditional distribution $F_{\boldsymbol{X}'|S=v}$ is supported on the following bounded set, called the *v-simplex*:

$$\mathcal{S}_v := \{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{d'} : \boldsymbol{x} \geq \mathbf{0}, 0 \leq x_1 + \cdots + x_{d'} \leq v\}. \tag{4.7}$$

Thanks to the compactness of the support, CLT is verified under some mild conditions. The following theorem is a direct consequence of well-known results in the theory of MCMC. However, it clarifies the conditions on the marginal loss densities and the copula densities, that are easy to be checked in the framework of joint risk modeling with copulas.

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose that the joint distribution $F_{\boldsymbol{X}}$ is supported on $\mathbb{R}_+^d$, and has marginal densities $f_1, f_2, \dots, f_d$ and a copula density c. Then, $\sqrt{N}$-CLT holds for the MCMC estimator (4.6) of VaR contributions if the following $(C1) - (C3)$ hold:*

(C1) $\epsilon := \inf_{\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y} \in [0,v]^{d'}} q(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) > 0$,

(C2) $f_j(x)$ *is positive and bounded above on* $[0, v]$ *for all* $j = 1, 2, \dots, d$,

(C3) $c(\boldsymbol{u})$ *is positive and bounded above on* $F_1([0, v]) \times \cdots \times F_d([0, v])$.

Proof. By Theorem 23 in Roberts and Rosenthal (2004), the $\sqrt{N}$-CLT holds if the Markov chain is *uniformly ergodic* whenever $\mathbb{E}[||\boldsymbol{X}'||^2|S = v] < \infty$. The moment condition is satisfied since

$$\mathbb{E}[X_i X_j|S = v] \leq \mathbb{E}[(X_1 + \cdots + X_d)^2|S = v] = v^2 < \infty \tag{4.8}$$

for any $i, j = 1, 2, \dots, d$. Thus, it suffices to show that the Markov chain is uniformly ergodic. By Theorem 1.3 in Mengersen and Tweeide (1996), the Markov chain is uniformly ergodic if (and only

if) the minorization condition (see, e.g., Rosenthal, 1995) holds on the whole space $\mathcal{S}_v$, i.e., there exist a positive integer n, $\delta > 0$ and a probability measure ν such that $P^n(\boldsymbol{x}, A) > \delta \cdot \nu(A)$ for all $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{S}_v$, $A \in \mathcal{B}_v$, where $\mathcal{B}_v := \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^{d'}) \cap \mathcal{S}_v$. By the conditions (C2), (C3), and that $\mathcal{S}_v \subset [0, v]^{d'}$, we have that

$$l := \inf_{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{S}_v} \pi(\boldsymbol{x}) > 0, \qquad u := \sup_{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{S}_v} \pi(\boldsymbol{x}) < +\infty. \tag{4.9}$$

Using (4.9) and the condition $(C1)$, the minorization condition can be checked as follows. For any $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{S}_v$, define

$$Q_{\boldsymbol{x}} := \left\{ \boldsymbol{y} \in \mathcal{S}_v : \frac{\pi(\boldsymbol{y})}{\pi(\boldsymbol{x})} \cdot \frac{q(\boldsymbol{y}, \boldsymbol{x})}{q(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y})} < 1 \right\}. \tag{4.10}$$

Then for all $A \in \mathcal{B}_v$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P(\boldsymbol{x}, A) &\geq \int_{Q_{\boldsymbol{x}}} q(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) \cdot \min \left[1, \frac{\pi(\boldsymbol{y})}{\pi(\boldsymbol{x})} \cdot \frac{q(\boldsymbol{y}, \boldsymbol{x})}{q(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y})} \right] d\boldsymbol{y} \\ &\quad + \int_{A \setminus Q_{\boldsymbol{x}}} q(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) \cdot \min \left[1, \frac{\pi(\boldsymbol{y})}{\pi(\boldsymbol{x})} \cdot \frac{q(\boldsymbol{y}, \boldsymbol{x})}{q(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y})} \right] d\boldsymbol{y} \\ &= \int_{Q_{\boldsymbol{x}}} \frac{\pi(\boldsymbol{y})}{\pi(\boldsymbol{x})} \cdot q(\boldsymbol{y}, \boldsymbol{x}) d\boldsymbol{y} + \int_{A \setminus Q_{\boldsymbol{x}}} q(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) d\boldsymbol{y} \\ &\geq \frac{\epsilon}{u} \int_{Q_{\boldsymbol{x}}} \pi(\boldsymbol{y}) d\boldsymbol{y} + \epsilon \int_{A \setminus Q_{\boldsymbol{x}}} \frac{\pi(\boldsymbol{y})}{u} d\boldsymbol{y} \\ &= \frac{\epsilon}{u} \pi(A). \end{aligned}$$

Taking $n = 1$, $\delta = \frac{\epsilon}{u}$ and $\nu = \pi$ completes the proof. □

We will see typical situations where the conditions $(C1) - (C3)$ hold. Firstly, the condition $(C1)$ holds when, for example, $q(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) = f(\boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{x})$, f is continuous, and positive on $[-v, v]^{d'}$. These conditions are satisfied for typical choices of f, such as Gaussian density or student's t density. Secondly, the condition $(C2)$ also holds when, for example $f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_d$ follow Pareto distributions with the density given by

$$f_j(x) = \frac{\kappa_j \gamma_j^{\kappa_j}}{(x + \gamma_j)^{\kappa_j + 1}} \qquad \kappa_j > 0,\ \gamma_j > 0 \qquad \text{for} \quad j = 1, 2, \ldots, d. \tag{4.11}$$

Lastly, the condition $(C3)$ can easily be checked for various copulas used in practice. For the use in Section 4, we especially focus on the following two examples:

Example 4.1 (t copula)**.** d-dimensional t copula density is of the form

$$c^t(\boldsymbol{u}) = \frac{\Gamma(\frac{\nu+d}{2})\Gamma(\frac{\nu}{2})}{|R|^{\frac{1}{2}}\Gamma(\frac{\nu+1}{2})^d} \cdot \frac{\left(1 + \frac{\boldsymbol{x}^{\mathrm{T}} R^{-1} \boldsymbol{x}}{\nu}\right)^{-\frac{\nu+d}{2}}}{\Pi_{j=1}^d (1 + \frac{x_j^2}{\nu})^{-\frac{\nu+1}{2}}}, \qquad \nu > 0 \tag{4.12}$$

where $R \in \mathcal{M}_+^{d \times d}[0, 1]$ is a correlation matrix, $\boldsymbol{x} = (t_\nu^{-1}(u_1), \ldots, t_\nu^{-1}(u_d))$ and t_ν is a cdf of the student's t distribution with degree of freedom ν. It is clear that (4.12) satisfies the condition $(C3)$ if $F_j(0) > 0$ for $j = 1, 2, 3$.

Example 4.2 (π-rotated Clayton copula)**.** d-dimensional π-rotated Clayton copula has a density

of the form (Yoshiba, 2013)

$$c_{\pi}^{Clayton}(\boldsymbol{u}) = \theta^d \cdot \frac{\Gamma(\frac{1}{\theta}+d)}{\Gamma(\frac{1}{\theta})} \cdot \left(\prod_{j=1}^{d}(1-u_j)^{-\theta-1}\right)\left[\sum_{j=1}^{d}(1-u_j)^{-\theta}-d+1\right]^{-\frac{1}{\theta}-d}, \qquad 0<\theta<\infty. \tag{4.13}$$

Since Clayton copula has a lower tail dependence, the π-rotated Clayton copula has an upper tail dependence. We will see that the π-rotated Clayton copula density (4.13) satisfies the condition $(C3)$ under some parameter constraint. Let $l_j := 1 - F_j(v) \in (0,1)$. Then, for any $u_j \in F_j([0,v])$, it holds that $0 < l_j \leq 1-u_j \leq 1-F_j(0) = 1$ for all $j = 1,2,\ldots,d$. Thus, we have

$$1 \leq \prod_{j=1}^{d}(1-u_j)^{-\theta-1} \leq \prod_{j=1}^{d} l_j^{-\theta-1} < \infty \tag{4.14}$$

and also

$$\left[\sum_{j=1}^{d} l_j^{-\theta}-d+1\right]^{-\frac{1}{\theta}-d} \leq \left[\sum_{j=1}^{d}(1-u_j)^{-\theta}-d+1\right]^{-\frac{1}{\theta}-d} \leq 1. \tag{4.15}$$

Since v is the p-th quantile of F_S, we have $l_j = 1 - F_j(v) \leq 1-p$. Using this inequality, the lower bound of (4.15) is positive if $\theta < \log(1-p)/\log(1-\frac{1}{d})$. Putting (4.14) and (4.15) together, the π-rotated Clayton copula density (4.13) satisfies the condition $(C3)$ when $0 < \theta < \log(1-p)/\log(1-\frac{1}{d})$.

In contrast to the pure-loss case, theoretical verification of CLT is challenging in the case when we model P&L, i.e. $\mathrm{supp}(F_{\boldsymbol{X}}) = \mathbb{R}^d$. Since the conditional distribution $F_{\boldsymbol{X}'|S=v}$ is supported on the unbounded space $\mathbb{R}^{d'}$, we need a careful investigation on the tail-behavior of the conditional density $f_{\boldsymbol{X}'|S=v}$. When the proposal distribution is MpCN, we can justify the CLT of our MCMC estimator for a certain class of target distributions based on the result in Kamatani (2016). As its example, we consider the case where the underlying loss vector $\boldsymbol{X}$ follows a multivariate student's t distribution.

Example 4.3 (Multivariate student's t distribution)**.** Let $\boldsymbol{X} \sim t_\nu(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \Sigma)$, where $\nu > 2$, $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\Sigma \in \mathcal{M}_+^{d\times d}$. The density of the multivariate student's t distribution is given by

$$f_{\boldsymbol{X}}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \frac{\Gamma(\frac{\nu+d}{2})}{|\Sigma|^{\frac{1}{2}}\Gamma(\frac{\nu}{2})\sqrt{(\pi\cdot d)^d}} \cdot \left(1+\frac{(\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu})^{\mathrm{T}}\Sigma^{-1}(\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu})}{\nu}\right)^{-\frac{\nu+d}{2}}. \tag{4.16}$$

Its conditional density $f_{\boldsymbol{X}'|S=v}$ can be specified as follows. Firstly, let $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \boldsymbol{0}$ for simplicity. Write

$$\Sigma^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & A_2 \\ A_2^{\mathrm{T}} & A_3 \end{pmatrix} =: A, \tag{4.17}$$

for $A_1 \in \mathcal{M}^{d'\times d'}(\mathbb{R})$, $A_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d'}$ and $A_3 \in \mathbb{R}$. Then, it holds that

$$\begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{x} \\ v - \boldsymbol{1}_{d'}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{x} \end{pmatrix}^{\mathrm{T}} \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & A_2 \\ A_2^{\mathrm{T}} & A_3 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{x} \\ v - \boldsymbol{1}_{d'}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{x} \end{pmatrix} = (\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{w})^{\mathrm{T}}V(\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{w}) + D, \tag{4.18}$$

where $V := A_1 - A_2\boldsymbol{1}_{d'}^{\mathrm{T}} - \boldsymbol{1}_{d'}A_2^{\mathrm{T}} + \boldsymbol{1}_{d'}\boldsymbol{1}_{d'}^{\mathrm{T}} \in \mathcal{M}_+^{d'\times d'}$, $\boldsymbol{w} := V^{-1}(vA_3\boldsymbol{1}_{d'} - vA_2) \in \mathbb{R}^{d'}$, and

$D := v^2 A_3 - \boldsymbol{w}^{\mathrm{T}} V \boldsymbol{w} \in \mathbb{R}$. Using (4.18), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\boldsymbol{X}'|S=v}(\boldsymbol{x}) &\propto f_{\boldsymbol{X}}(\boldsymbol{x}, v - \mathbf{1}_{d'}^{\mathrm{T}} \boldsymbol{x}) \\ &\propto \left(1 + \frac{(\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{w})^{\mathrm{T}} V (\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{w}) + D}{\nu}\right)^{-\frac{\nu+d}{2}} \\ &\propto \left(1 + \frac{(\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{w})^{\mathrm{T}} V (\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{w})}{\nu + D}\right)^{-\frac{\nu+d}{2}}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.19}$$

Provided $\nu + D > 0$, $\boldsymbol{X}'|S = v$ follows a d'-dimensional elliptical distribution with the location parameter $\boldsymbol{w}$, scale parameter V^{-1} and the density generator $g : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$ given by

$$g(x) = \left(1 + \frac{x}{\nu + D}\right)^{-\frac{\nu+d}{2}}. \tag{4.20}$$

This type of distribution is called the *Pearson type VII distribution* (see e.g., Schmidt, 2002).

Consider the MCMC estimator (4.6) where $\pi = f_{\boldsymbol{X}'|S=v}$ and the proposal distribution q is MpCN (3.16). By Theorem 25 in Roberts and Rosenthal (2004), a $\sqrt{N}$-CLT holds if the Markov chain is geometrically ergodic and $\mathbb{E}[||\boldsymbol{X}'||^2|S = v] < \infty$. By Proposition 3.4 in Kamatani (2016), the Markov chain with MpCN proposal distribution is geometrically ergodic if $\mathbb{E}[||\boldsymbol{X}'||^\delta|S = v] < \infty$ for some $\delta > 0$, $\pi(\boldsymbol{x})$ is strictly positive and continuous, and moreover, it is symmetrically regularly varying, i.e.,

$$\lim_{r \to +\infty} \frac{\pi(r\boldsymbol{x})}{\pi(r\mathbf{1}_d)} = \lambda(\boldsymbol{x}), \tag{4.21}$$

for some $\lambda : \mathbb{R} \to (0, \infty)$ such that $\lambda(\boldsymbol{x}) = 1$ for any $\boldsymbol{x} \in S_W^{d'-1}$, where $S_W^{d'-1} := \{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{d'} : ||W^{-\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{x}|| = ||W^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{1}_{d'}||\}$ and $W \in \mathcal{M}_+^{d' \times d'}$. We will firstly see that all the moment conditions hold, and then, the tail condition (4.21) is also satisfied for $\pi = f_{\boldsymbol{X}'|S=v}$.

Write $R := ||\boldsymbol{X}'||$. It can be shown that g is regularly varying (see, e.g., Resnick, 2013) at ∞ with index $\alpha = -\frac{\nu+d}{2}$, i.e.

$$\lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{g(rx)}{g(r)} = x^{-\frac{\nu+d}{2}} \qquad x > 0. \tag{4.22}$$

By Proposition 3.7 in Schmidt (2002), $f_{R|S=v}$ is regularly varying with index $-(\nu + 1)$. Then, by Karamata's Theorem (see, e.g., Resnick, 2013, Theorem 0.6), $F_{R|S=v}$ is regularly varying with index $-\nu$. Therefore, $\mathbb{E}[R^\delta|S = v] < \infty$ holds for all $\delta < \nu$ (see, e.g., Mikosch, 1999). Thus all the moment conditions above are satisfied so long as $\nu > 2$. In elliptical case, the tail condition (4.21) is a direct consequence of (4.22). Since $(\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{w})^{\mathrm{T}} V (\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{w}) > 0$ for all $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{d'}$, it holds that

$$\lim_{r \to +\infty} \frac{f_{\boldsymbol{X}'|S=v}(r\boldsymbol{x})}{f_{\boldsymbol{X}'|S=v}(r\mathbf{1}_d)} = \left(\frac{||V^{\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{x}||}{||V^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{1}_{d'}||}\right)^{-(\nu+d)}, \qquad \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{d'}. \tag{4.23}$$

Thus, taking

$$\lambda(\boldsymbol{x}) := \left(\frac{||V^{\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{x}||}{||V^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{1}_{d'}||}\right)^{-(\nu+d)}, \qquad W = V^{-1} \tag{4.24}$$

in (4.21) yields that $\pi = f_{\boldsymbol{X}'|S=v}$ is symmetrically regularly varying. Putting them together, we can find that the MCMC estimator with MpCN proposal distribution satisfies $\sqrt{N}$-CLT when the underlying loss vector follows multivariate student's t distribution with $\nu > 2$ and $D > -\nu$.

5 Simulation and numerical studies

We have shown that the MCMC estimator has various attractive properties for the estimation of VaR contributions. In this section, we apply the proposed estimator to various risk models used in practice. Our numerical experiment shows that the MCMC estimator has smaller bias and Mean Squared Error (MSE) compared with the existing estimators that have been proposed in the previous studies. Then, based on some numerical results, we study how to choose an appropriate proposal distribution given risk model.

5.1 Numerical study of the MCMC estimator

In the simulation study, we consider four risk models which are modeled with marginal densities and copula densities. As is often done in risk management, we adopt heavy-tailed marginal distributions and copulas with tail dependence. In all risk models, we set the size of the portfolio $d = 3$. The models are described as follows:

(1) The loss random variable X_j follows Pareto distribution (4.11) with $\kappa_j = 4$ and $\gamma_j = 3$ for all $j = 1, 2, 3$. The loss vector (X_1, X_2, X_3) has a π-rotated Clayton copula (4.13) with $\theta = 0.5$.
(2) X_j, $(j = 1, 2, 3)$ have the same marginals as in the case (1). However, their copula is a student's t copula (4.12) with $\nu = 4$ and the correlation matrix given by

$$P = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -0.5 & 0.3 \\ -0.5 & 1 & 0.5 \\ 0.3 & 0.5 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{5.1}$$

(3) X_j follows student's t distribution with $\nu_j = 4$, $\mu_j = 0$ and $\sigma_j = 1$ for all $j = 1, 2, 3$. (X_1, X_2, X_3) has a π-rotated Clayton copula with $\theta = 0.5$.
(4) The loss random vector (X_1, X_2, X_3) follows a multivariate student's t distribution (4.16) with $\nu = 4$, $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \mathbf{0}$, and Σ given by (5.1).

The former two models (1) and (2) treat pure losses, and the latter two models (3) and (4) handle P&L. In all models, marginal distributions have variance 2.0. Moreover, they are heavy-tailed with tail index 5.0. The models (1) and (3) possess homogeneous upper tail dependence with tail coefficient $\lambda^U_{i,j} = 0.025$ (see, e.g., Joe, 2014). The models (2) and (4) have symmetric upper, lower, and upper-lower tail dependences with tail coefficients $\lambda^U_{1,2} = \lambda^L_{1,2} = 0.012$, $\lambda^U_{1,3} = \lambda^L_{1,3} = 0.162$, $\lambda^U_{2,3} = \lambda^L_{2,3} = 0.253$, $\lambda^{UL}_{1,2} = \lambda^{LU}_{1,2} = 0.253$, $\lambda^{UL}_{1,3} = \lambda^{LU}_{1,3} = 0.029$, and $\lambda^{UL}_{2,3} = \lambda^{LU}_{2,3} = 0.012$.

For each risk model, we compute several estimators of VaR contributions $\mathrm{AC} = \mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{X}|S = \mathrm{VaR}_p(S)]$ for $p = 0.999$, with the $\mathrm{VaR}_p(S)$ replaced by its Monte Carlo estimator $v = S^{[Np]}$. In this setting, the condition $(C3)$ in Theorem 4.1 holds in the risk models (1) and (2) since $\log(1-p)/\log(1-1/d) = 17.037 > 0.5 = \theta$. Also, as shown in Example 4.3, the risk model (4) with MpCN proposal distribution satisfies CLT since $D + \nu = 137.935 > 0$. The estimators that we study are the Monte Carlo (MC) estimator (2.11), Nadaraya-Watson (NW) estimator (2.13) (Tasche, 2009), Generalized regression (GR) estimator (2.15) (Tasche and Tibiletti, 2004; Hallerbach, 2003), and the MCMC estimator (4.6) proposed in this paper:

$$\widehat{\mathrm{AC}}^{\mathrm{MC}}_{\delta,N} = \frac{1}{M_{\delta,N}} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \boldsymbol{X}^{(n)} \cdot 1_{[S^{(n)} \in A_\delta]}, \qquad \widehat{\mathrm{AC}}^{\mathrm{NW}}_{\phi,h,N} = \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{N} \boldsymbol{X}^{(n)} \cdot \phi\left(\frac{S^{(n)}-v}{h}\right)}{\sum_{n=1}^{N} \phi\left(\frac{S^{(n)}-v}{h}\right)},$$

$$\widehat{\mathrm{AC}}^{\mathrm{GR}}_{g_{\boldsymbol{\beta}},N} = g_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_N}(v), \qquad \widehat{\mathrm{AC}}^{\mathrm{MCMC}}_{q,N} = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=1}^{N} \boldsymbol{X}^{(n)}_{|S=v},$$

where $\boldsymbol{X}^{(n)} \overset{i.i.d.}{\sim} F_{\boldsymbol{X}}$, $S^{(n)} := X_1^{(n)} + \cdots + X_d^{(n)} \overset{i.i.d.}{\sim} F_S$, and $\{\boldsymbol{X}^{(n)}_{|S=v}\}_{n=1,\ldots,N}$ is an N-sample path of a Markov chain with stationary distribution $F_{\boldsymbol{X}|S=v}$.

For all estimators, we fix the sample size $N = 10^6$. Other parameters of the estimators above are determined as follows. First, on the MC estimator, we set $\delta > 0$ such that the MC sample size $M_{\delta,N}$ is around 10^3. As in Glasserman (2003), asymptotic normality

$$\sqrt{M_{\delta,N}} \cdot (\widehat{\mathrm{AC}}^{\mathrm{MC}}_{\delta,N} - \mathrm{AC}_\delta) \to \mathcal{N}_d(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma_\delta), \qquad \text{as} \quad N \to +\infty \tag{5.2}$$

holds for a fixed δ. Using this result, we report the estimate of $\widehat{\mathrm{AC}}^{\mathrm{MC}}_{\delta,N}$ and its approximated standard error $s^{(j,j)}_{MC}/\sqrt{M_{\delta,N}}$ for $j = 1, 2, 3$, where s_{MC} is the sample standard error defined by

$$s_{MC} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{M_{\delta,N}}\sum_{n=1}^{N} (\boldsymbol{X}^{(n)} - \widehat{\mathrm{AC}}^{\mathrm{MC}}_{\delta,N})^{\mathrm{T}} (\boldsymbol{X}^{(n)} - \widehat{\mathrm{AC}}^{\mathrm{MC}}_{\delta,N}) \cdot 1_{[S^{(n)} \in A_\delta]}}. \tag{5.3}$$

Second, on the NW estimator, we choose the kernel density ϕ the standard normal density. We decide the bandwidth $h > 0$ according to the Silverman's rule of thumb $h = 1.06 \cdot \hat{\sigma}_S \cdot N^{-1/5}$ (Silverman, 1986). Although asymptotic normality holds for the NW estimator, its asymptotic variance can hardly be computed because it requires the calculation of $f_S(v)$. Therefore, we report only the estimate of $\widehat{\mathrm{AC}}^{\mathrm{NW}}_{\phi,h,N}$. Third, on the GR estimator, we choose $g_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(s) = \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + \boldsymbol{\beta}_1 \cdot s$ and its coefficients are estimated by

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{N,1} = \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{N}(\boldsymbol{X}^{(n)} - \bar{\boldsymbol{X}}_N)(S^{(n)} - \bar{S}_N)}{\sum_{n=1}^{N}(S^{(n)} - \bar{S}_N)^2} \qquad \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{N,0} = \bar{\boldsymbol{X}}_N - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{N,1} \cdot \bar{S}_N, \tag{5.4}$$

where $\bar{\boldsymbol{X}}_N = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=1}^{N} \boldsymbol{X}^{(n)}$ and $\bar{S}_N = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=1}^{N} S^{(n)}$. According to the general theory of OLS, it holds under some regularity conditions that

$$\sqrt{N} \cdot \left[\begin{pmatrix} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(j)}_{N,0} \\ \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(j)}_{N,1} \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(j)}_0 \\ \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(j)}_1 \end{pmatrix} \right] \to N_2(\mathbf{0}_2, \sigma^2_{\varepsilon_j} Q^{-1}), \qquad \text{as} \quad N \to +\infty \tag{5.5}$$

for $j = 1, 2, 3$, where $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(j)}_{N,k}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(j)}_k$ is the j-th component of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{N,k}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_k$ for $k = 1$ and 2, respectively, ε_j is the j-th component of the error term $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$, $\sigma^2_{\varepsilon_j}$ is its conditional variance given $S_{(1)}, \ldots, S_{(N)}$, and

$$Q := \lim_{N\to\infty} \boldsymbol{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{Y}/N \qquad \text{where} \qquad \boldsymbol{Y} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ S^{(1)} & \ldots & S^{(N)} \end{pmatrix}^{\mathrm{T}}. \tag{5.6}$$

According to this result, we report the estimate of $\widehat{\mathrm{AC}}^{\mathrm{GR}}_{g_{\boldsymbol{\beta}},N}$ and its approximated standard error $s^{(j)}_{GR}/\sqrt{N}$ for $j = 1, 2, 3$, where

$$s^{(j)}_{GR} := \sqrt{\hat{\Sigma}^{(1,1)}_{GR,j} + 2v \cdot \hat{\Sigma}^{(1,2)}_{GR,j} + v^2 \cdot \hat{\Sigma}^{(2,2)}_{GR,j}}, \tag{5.7}$$

$\hat{\Sigma}_{GR,j} = \hat{\sigma}^2_{\varepsilon_j} \cdot (\boldsymbol{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{Y}/N)^{-1}$ and $\hat{\sigma}_{\varepsilon_j}$ is the sample standard error of the j-th residuals. Finally, on the MCMC estimator, we choose different proposal distributions depending on the risk models

(1)-(4): (1) Random walk proposal $q(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) = f(\boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{x})$ with $f \sim \mathcal{N}_d(\boldsymbol{0}, \hat{\Sigma}_v)$, where $\hat{\Sigma}_v := s_{MC}^2$, for s_{MC} defined in (5.3), (2) Independent proposal $q(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) = f(\boldsymbol{y})$, where f is the density of the Dirichlet distribution with parameters (0.2, 0.28, 0.6), (3) and (4) MpCN proposal with $\rho = 0.8$, $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\widehat{\mathrm{AC}}^{\mathrm{GR}}_{g_{\boldsymbol{\beta}},N}{}', v - \mathbf{1}_{d'}^{\mathrm{T}} \widehat{\mathrm{AC}}^{\mathrm{GR}}_{g_{\boldsymbol{\beta}},N}{}')^{\mathrm{T}}$ and $\Sigma := s_{MC}^2$. In the Algorithm 2, we set the initial state $\boldsymbol{x}^{(1)} = (v/3, v/3, v/3)^{\mathrm{T}}$. We suppose that asymptotic normality (3.8) holds for all risk models. Also, its asymptotic variance is estimated by the batch means estimator $\hat{\Sigma}_N$ defined by (3.10). Following the recommendation of Jones et al. (2006), we choose $L_N := \lfloor N^{\frac{1}{2}} \rfloor = 10^3$ and $B_N := \lfloor N/L_N \rfloor = \lfloor N^{\frac{1}{2}} \rfloor = 10^3$. We report the estimate of $\widehat{\mathrm{AC}}^{\mathrm{MCMC}}_{q,N}$ and its approximated standard error $\hat{\Sigma}_N^{(j,j)}/\sqrt{N}$ for $j = 1, 2, 3$.

As mentioned in Section 3.2, the validity of the MCMC method can empirically be checked by autocorrelation plots and the acceptance rate. Fig. 1 show the autocorrelation plots of the Markov chains generated by Algorithm 2. The acceptance rate of the MH algorithm in each risk model was



Figure 1: Autocorrelation plots of the Markov chains generated by algorithm 2: (a) Pareto + π-rotated Clayton, (b) Pareto + t copula, (c) Student's t + π-rotated Clayton, and (d) Student's t + t copula. The dotted line represents $y = 0.1$.

(1) 0.556, (2) 0.186, (3) 0.643, and (4) 0.757. In Fig. 1, we can observe that the autocorrelation plots steadily decline below 0.1 by the lag h around 30 for all risk models. Together with the moderate acceptance rates, we can confirm that the choice of the proposal distributions above are appropriate for all risk models.

Before showing the estimation results, we check the shapes of the conditional distributions $F_{\boldsymbol{X}'|S=v}$ by plotting the Markov chains generated by Algorithm 2. Fig. 2 shows the contour plots of the generated Markov chains. According to these plots, the features of the conditional



Figure 2: Contour plots of the Markov chains generated by algorithm 2: (a) Pareto + π-rotated Clayton, (b) Pareto + t copula, (c) Student's t + π-rotated Clayton, and (d) Student's t + t copula. When drawing the contour plots, we used subsamples, which are picked up every 100-th points of the original Markov chains, to elliminate the dependence among samples. We plot only the first and second variables of the 3-dimensional Markov chains since the last variable can be determined by the sum-constraint. The gray diagonal lines in the plots represent $y = -x + v$, where v is the estimate of $\mathrm{VaR}_p(S)$. The contour plots approximately express the conditional distributions $F_{\boldsymbol{X}'|S=v}$.

distributions $F_{\boldsymbol{X}'|S=v}$ are summarized as follows:

(1) *Pareto + π-rotated Clayton :* the contour plot Fig. 2 (a) shows that $F_{\boldsymbol{X}'|S=v}$ has a unique mode at the center of the Simplex. Most probability of $F_{\boldsymbol{X}'|S=v}$ is concentrated around the mode, and the probability decreases as going far away from the center. Also, the contour plot is almost symmetric at the diagonal line $y = x$.

(2) *Pareto + t copula :* Unlike the case (1), $F_{\boldsymbol{X}'|S=v}$ possesses two distinct modes near the x- and y-axes. Especially near the y-axis, there is a peak around which the probability changes significantly. Also, the contour plot Fig. 2 (b) is asymmetric at the diagonal line $y = x$.

(3) *Student's t + π-rotated Clayton :* Although $\boldsymbol{X}'|S = v$ can take negative values, it is supported almost on the bounded simplex as in the case (1). The contour plot Fig. 2 (c) is unimodal and almost symmetric around $y = x$. Also, the tail of $F_{\boldsymbol{X}'|S=v}$ is apparently light.

(4) *Student's t + t copula :* As discussed in Section 4.3, the conditional distribution $F_{\boldsymbol{X}'|S=v}$ in this case follows the Pearson type *VII* distribution given by (4.19). From the contour plot Fig. 2 (d), we can observe some properties of this type of distribution, such as elliptical symmetry

and tail-heaviness. Unlike the case (3), $\boldsymbol{X}'|S = v$ takes large negative values beyond the bounded simplex.

The results of our estimation are summarized in Table 1. In the four different risk models (1)-(4), we report the estimates, its approximated standard errors, biases, and Root MSE (RMSE)s of the four different estimators MC, NW, GR, and MCMC.

In the first risk model where marginals follow Pareto distributions and they have a π-rotated Clayton copula, true VaR contributions can be computed explicitly. The true value is obtained by allocating the total VaR homogeneously because the marginal distributions are homogeneous and the copula is exchangeable. In this case, we observe that the MC and the NW estimators have relatively large biases. In contrast, the GR and the MCMC estimators have smaller biases compared with the first two. The GR estimator still has some bias caused by the model-misspecification, although its standard error is quite small. In the viewpoint of MSE, the MCMC estimator outperforms all the other estimators.

The second risk model has the same marginal distributions as in the case (1), but their copula is t copula having upper-lower tail dependence. Even though the true VaR contributions are not available in this case, we can construct its 95% confidence interval based on the MCMC estimator by using (3.12). Based on this interval of the true value, we computed the range of the bias and RMSE for other estimators. The reported ranges of bias and RMSE in Table 1 (2) show that the MCMC estimator significantly improves the performance of other estimators. Under the risk model (2), all estimators suffer from bias caused by asymmetry and multi-modality of the conditional distribution $F_{\boldsymbol{X}'|S=v}$ as seen in Fig. 2 (b). Especially, in contrast with the good performance of the GR in the case (1), the GR estimator has relatively large bias and RMSE in this case.

The third risk model examines the case where the marginal distributions are student's t distribution and their copula is π-rotated Clayton. The true VaR contributions can be computed similarly as in the case (1). Thanks to symmetry and uni-modality of the conditional distribution $F_{\boldsymbol{X}'|S=v}$, all estimators remain small bias and RMSE. Together with the results in the cases (1) and (2), it can be found that the GR estimator performs well so long as $F_{\boldsymbol{X}'|S=v}$ does not have irregular shape, such as asymmetry and multi-modality. Also, the MCMC estimator reduces bias and RMSE compared with the MC and the NW estimators.

The final risk model illustrates the case where the underlying portfolio loss vector follows the multivariate student's t distribution. In this case, the true VaR contributions is available by the formula (2.17). In such an elliptical case, the GR estimator provides a quite accurate estimate. Although the conditional distribution $F_{\boldsymbol{X}'|S=v}$ is heavy-tailed as seen in Fig. 2 (d), the MCMC estimator keeps high performance compared with the MC and the NW estimators. Its bias is significantly improved compared with the MC and the NW. Additionally, its standard error and RMSE are also lower than those of the MC estimator.

Throughout the numerical study, the MCMC estimator provided significantly small bias and RMSE regardless of the shape of the conditional distribution $F_{\boldsymbol{X}'|S=v}$. Under the case when $F_{\boldsymbol{X}'|S=v}$ is unimodal and symmetric, the GR estimator also had good performance. On the other hand, at least in our numerical study, the MC and the NW estimator had larger bias and RMSE compared with other estimators.

At the end of this section, we summarize the advantages of the MCMC estimator compared with the other estimators. First, the MCMC estimator is consistent although the other estimators are not always. As explained in Section 2, the MC, the NW, and the GR estimators have biases which can not be evaluated easily. In Table 1, we observed that these estimators have some

Table 1: Performance of the four different estimators of VaR contributions under four different risk models[†].

	Estimate of AC (Bias):				*Standard error ($\sqrt{MSE}$):*		
Estimator	***MC***	***NW***	***GR***	***MCMC***	***MC***	***GR***	***MCMC***
(1) Pareto + π-rotated Clayton: True AC = (11.265, 11.265, 11.265)							
AC_1	11.298	11.550	11.297	11.258	0.166	0.008	0.016
	(0.033)	(0.2859)	(0.033)	(-0.007)	(0.169)	(0.033)	(0.017)
AC_2	10.796	11.481	11.204	11.263	0.164	0.008	0.017
	(-0.469)	(0.216)	(-0.061)	(-0.001)	(0.497)	(0.061)	(0.017)
AC_3	10.631	10.762	11.293	11.273	0.167	0.008	0.016
	(-0.634)	(-0.503)	(0.028)	(0.008)	(0.655)	(0.029)	(0.018)
(2) Pareto + t copula: True AC is not available ‡							
AC_1	7.475	6.907	7.772	7.338	0.247	0.010	0.050
	(0.039,	(-0.529,	(0.336,	(-0.098,	(0.250,	(0.034,	(0.050,
	0.234)	-0.333)	0.532)	0.098)	0.694)	0.532)	0.110)
AC_2	8.156	8.878	8.715	8.744	0.226	0.010	0.031
	(-0.649,	(0.072,	(-0.090,	(-0.062,	(0.229,	(0.010,	(0.031,
	-0.526)	0.196)	0.033)	0.062)	0.687)	0.532)	0.103)
AC_3	11.803	12.415	11.710	12.115	0.142	0.006	0.030
	(-0.371,	(0.241,	(-0.463,	(-0.058,	(0.147,	(0.033,	(0.030,
	-0.255)	0.357)	-0.347)	0.058)	0.664)	0.532)	0.102)
(3) Student's t + π-rotated Clayton : True AC = (5.917, 5.917, 5.917)							
AC_1	5.919	6.046	5.921	5.915	0.077	0.005	0.016
	(0.002)	(0.129)	(0.003)	(-0.002)	(0.077)	(0.006)	(0.016)
AC_2	5.710	6.009	5.918	5.940	0.077	0.005	0.016
	(-0.208)	(0.092)	(0.001)	(0.023)	(0.221)	(0.006)	(0.028)
AC_3	5.638	5.702	5.913	5.897	0.078	0.005	0.014
	(-0.279)	(-0.215)	(-0.004)	(-0.021)	(0.290)	(0.007)	(0.025)
(4) Student's t + t copula : True AC = (2.972, 3.715, 6.686)							
AC_1	3.028	3.559	2.989	3.004	0.125	0.007	0.034
	(0.056)	(0.587)	(0.017)	(0.032)	(0.136)	(0.019)	(0.046)
AC_2	3.482	3.053	3.701	3.687	0.112	0.006	0.033
	(-0.233)	(-0.662)	(-0.013)	(-0.028)	(0.259)	(0.015)	(0.044)
AC_3	6.526	6.736	6.682	6.683	0.046	0.002	0.011
	(-0.161)	(0.050)	(-0.004)	(-0.004)	(0.167)	(0.005)	(0.011)

[†] The estimate is computed for the Monte Carlo ***MC***, the Nadaraya Watson ***NW***, the generalized regression ***GR***, and the Markov chain Monte Carlo ***MCMC*** estimators. The standard error is computed except for the NW estimator. The bias and RMSE are also computed for the cases (1), (3), and (4), where true VaR contributions are available. The sample size is $N = 10^6$. The proposal distributions of the MCMC estimators are (1) Random Walk, (2) Independent, (3) MpCN, and (4) MpCN.

[‡] In the case (2), where true VaR contributions are not available, the range of bias and RMSE are computed based on the 95% confidence interval of the true VaR contributions derived by the MCMC estimator (3.12). Based on the confidence interval $AC_L < AC < AC_U$ and the estimate $\widehat{\mathrm{AC}}_N$, we compute the range of the bias $(\widehat{\mathrm{AC}}_N - AC_U, \widehat{\mathrm{AC}}_N - AC_L)$. The range of RMSE is computed in the same way.

biases even when their standard errors are sufficiently small. In contrast, the MCMC estimator provides the accurate estimate of the VaR contributions due to its consistency. Together with the CLT, we also can construct the confidence interval of the true VaR contributions. Second, the MCMC estimator has great sample efficiency compared with the MC estimator. Since the MCMC estimator generates sample not from $F_{\boldsymbol{X}}$ but from $F_{\boldsymbol{X}'|S=v}$, no sample have to be discarded. In addition, unlike the MC, there is no trade-off between the bias and the sample efficiency. Thanks to these properties, the MCMC estimator can hold low standard error without increasing the bias. Finally, the MCMC estimator can maintain high performance even when the conditional distribution $F_{\boldsymbol{X}'|S=v}$ has irregular shape, such as multi-modality and heavy-tailed. As compared with the results in the case (2) and others in Table 1, the performance of the GR estimator highly depends on the shape of $F_{\boldsymbol{X}'|S=v}$. For the existing estimators, it is generally difficult to reflect the shape of $F_{\boldsymbol{X}'|S=v}$ to their hyper-parameters. On the other hand, for the MCMC estimator, we can directly capture the shape of $F_{\boldsymbol{X}'|S=v}$ through the proposal distribution q. By choosing an appropriate proposal distribution q, the MCMC estimator has stably good performance regardess of the shape of $F_{\boldsymbol{X}'|S=v}$.

5.2 Empirical study of the proposal distribution

In Section 5.1, we have shown that the MCMC estimator improves the performance of estimating VaR contributions. However, the performance of the MCMC estimator highly depends on the appropriate choice of the proposal distribution q. Additionally, the choice of proposal distribution is less apparent compared with that of hyper-parameters for the other estimators. In this section, we firstly investigate the symptoms caused by the bad choice of q. Then, we consider how to overcome this problem based on the numerical results.

Bad choice of q is largely classified into two cases. One is that, the proposal distribution q often generates a candidate at which the probability measured by π is quite small. This case occurs for example when the variance of q is much larger than that of π, or when q does not capture the irregular shape of π as appeared in Fig. 2 (b). In such cases, the Markov chain moves quite slowly, yielding high asymptotic standard error of the MCMC estimator. This symptom appears as a quite low acceptance rate and high autocorrelation plots. The other case is that the proposal distribution q generates only some parts of the whole support of the target distribution π. This case happens for example when π has distinct local modes and the variance of q is so small that the chain can not pass between them. In this case, the estimate has a significant bias, although the acceptance rate and the autocorrelation plots are seemingly fine. This symptom appears as a distorted plot of the MCMC samples whose shape is clearly different from the target distribution π.

How can we detect and avoid such fallacious estimates? First of all, as mentioned in Section 3.2, it is indispensable to check the acceptance rate and the autocorrelation plots. Additionally, it is also important to draw the plots of the generated Markov chain, and compare them with the plots of the MC samples whose sums belong to $A_\delta = [v - \delta, v + \delta]$. Since such MC samples follow the distribution $F_{\boldsymbol{X}'|S\in A_\delta}$, we can recognize the distortion of the generated Markov chain by comparing with the two plots of the samples. In the case of our numerical study, Fig. 3 shows the scatter plots of the MC samples whose sums belong to $[v - \delta, v + \delta]$, overlaid on the scatter plots of the MCMC samples. We can check in Fig. 3 that the shape of the scatter plots of the MCMC samples bear striking resemblance to those of the MC samples for all risk models.

Finally, we found that dependence information of the underlying risk model is quite helpful for the selection of q. When the copula C of the underlying risk model represents only upper



Figure 3: Scatter plots of the MC (•) and the MCMC (∘) samples for different risk models: (a) Pareto + π-rotated Clayton, (b) Pareto + t copula, (c) Student's t + π-rotated Clayton, (d) Student's t + t copula. We plot the MC samples generated from $F_{\boldsymbol{X}}$ such that their sums belong to $A_\delta = [v-\delta, v+\delta]$. In the four risk models, the value of δ are (1) 4.8, (2) 3.9, (3) 2.2, and (4) 1.7. When drawing the scatter plots of the MCMC samples, we used subsamples, which are picked up every 100-th points among the original Markov chains. We plot only the first and second variables of 3-dimensional samples since the last variable is determined by the sum-constraint. The plots of the MC, and the MCMC samples express the distribution $F_{\boldsymbol{X}'|S\in A_\delta}$ and $F_{\boldsymbol{X}'|S=v}$, respectively.

and/or lower tail dependence, then the target distribution π is likely to be tractable. For example in the cases of risk models (1) and (3), where the copula C has an upper tail dependence, the contour plots Fig. 2 (a) and (c) show that the target distribution π is unimodal and light-tailed. These features facilitate the estimation with MCMC since simple proposal distributions such as Random Walk proposal (3.14) perform well. Conversely, when the copula C has upper-lower tail dependence, then the target π tends to be complicated. In the cases (2) and (4), where the copula C has upper-lower tail dependence, the Fig. 2 (b) indicates that the π is bimodal, and also the contour plot Fig. 2 (d) shows that the π is heavy-tailed. In such cases, careful selection of the proposal function q is required for the good performance of the MCMC estimator. For instance, to capture the bi-modality appeared in the contour plot Fig. 2 (b), one of the good choice of q is an independent proposal distribution (3.15) with f the Dirichlet distribution on the v-simplex $\mathcal{S}_v$. Since Dirichlet distribution can possess two distinct modes around the edges of the simplex, we can generate a candidate which often visits the two separated modes of the π. In the case (4), to overcome the problem of heavy-tailedness of π seen in the contour plot Fig. 2 (d), it is necessary to adopt some specialized MCMC for heavy-tailed target distribution, such as MpCN (3.16).

6 Concluding remarks

Computing VaR contributions for a continuous risk model is a difficult task in general. There is no standard method since existing estimators have their own deficiencies. Especially, it can be seen that the crude Monte Carlo estimator suffers from unavoidable bias to the true VaR contributions. Our MCMC estimator proposed enables the consistent estimation of VaR contributions. Its sample efficiency is significantly improved because the MCMC estimator is computed by samples generated directly from the conditional density of a portfolio loss given the sum constraint. Moreover, since the MCMC estimator can capture the features of the risk model more directly than the existing estimators, it can maintain high performance even when the shape of the underlying loss distribution is far from elliptical. We showed some theoretical properties of the MCMC estimator, such as consistency and asymptotic normality. The consistency follows naturally from the construction of the estimator. We provided some conditions and example where CLT holds. By the general theory of MCMC, its asymptotic variance can be consistently estimated. We numerically compared the performance of various estimators of VaR contributions for typical risk models used in practice. The simulation results showed that, in most risk models we considered, the MCMC estimator had smaller bias and MSE compared with the existing estimators.

Although the MCMC estimator has good theoretical properties and numerically shows great performance, some remaining issues merit future research. Firstly, although we provided guidelines to choose good proposal distribution, they are hardly applicable when the dimension of the target distribution is too high to visualize. For such high-dimensional cases, asymptotic analysis and adaptive method should be developed to chooce good proposal distribution. Secondly, theoretical investigation of the conditional joint distribution given the sum constraint is still unsatisfactory. Our concern mainly lies with the influence of the underlying copula of a risk model to the shape of the conditional joint distribution, such as tail behavior and multi-modality. We believe that revealing these relations helps to find a better proposal distribution in our context of estimating VaR contributions. Finally, our MCMC method can potentially be extended to the computation of *Expected shortfall (ES) contributions*. The ES contributions can be derived as a conditional expectation of losses given that the total loss is equal to or greater than VaR (see Tasche, 2001). Due to its similar structure to the VaR contributions, the ES contributions can also be efficiently estimated in an analogous method proposed in this paper. This, and other potential extensions are currently being studied by us.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Paul Embrechts for his valuable comments and Kengo Kamatani for a fruitful discussion on MCMC. Our research is supported by the Core-to-Core program (Japan Society for the Promotion of Science: JSPS) in Keio Univeristy.

References

[1] C. Bluhm, L. Overbeck, and C. Wagner. *Introduction to credit risk modeling*. CRC Press, 2016.

[2] S. Chib and E. Greenberg. Understanding the metropolis-hastings algorithm. *The american statistician*, 49(4), 327-335, 1995.

[3] M. Denault. Coherent allocation of risk capital. *Journal of Risk*, 4(1):1-34, 2001.

[4] A. Dev, editor. *Economic Capital: A Practitioner Guide,* 2004. Risk Books.

[5] C. Geyer. Introduction to markov chain monte carlo. *Handbook of Markov Chain Monte Carlo*, 3-48, 2012.

[6] P. Glasserman. *Monte Carlo methods in financial engineering.* Springer Science & Business Media, 2003.

[7] P. Glasserman. Measuring marginal risk contributions in credit portfolios. *Journal of Computational Finance*, 9:1-41, 2005.

[8] W. Hallerbach. Decomposing portfolio value-at-risk: a general analysis. *Journal of Risk*, 5(2):1-18, 2003.

[9] B. Hansen. Nadaraya-Watson and local linear regression. Lecture Note available at http://www.ssc.wisc.edu/%7Ebhansen/718/718.htm, 2009.

[10] W. K. Hastings. Monte Carlo sampling methods using Markov chains and their applications. *Biometrika*, 57:97-109.

[11] X. Huang, C.W. Oosterlee, and M.A.M. Mesters. Computation of VaR and VaR contribution in the Vasicek portfolio credit loss model: a comparative study. *Journal of Credit Risk*, 3(3), 75-96, 2007.

[12] H. Joe. *Dependence modeling with copulas.* CRC Press, 2014.

[13] G. L. Jones, M. Haran, B. S. Caffo, and R. Neath. Fixed-width output analysis for Markov chain Monte Carlo. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 101(476):1537-1547, 2006.

[14] M. Kalkbrener. An axiomatic approach to capital allocation. *Mathematical Finance*, 15(3):425-437, 2005.

[15] K. Kamatani. Efficient strategy for the Markov chain Monte Carlo in high-dimension with heavy-tailed target probability distribution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6231*, 2014

[16] K. Kamatani, Ergodicity of Markov chain Monte Carlo with reversible proposal. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1602.02889*, 2016.

[17] S. Livingstone. Geometric ergodicity of the Random Walk Metropolis with position-dependent proposal covariance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1507.05780*, 2015.

[18] H. Mausser and D. Rosen. Economic credit capital allocation and risk contributions. *Handbooks in Operations Research and Management Science*, 15:681-726, 2007.

[19] A. J. McNeil, R. Frey, and P. Embrechts. *Quantitative risk management: Concepts, techniques and tools.* Princeton university press. 2015.

[20] K. L. Mengersen and R. L. Tweedie. Rates of convergence of the Hastings and Metropolis algorithms. *The Annals of Statistics*, 24(1):101-121, 1996.

[21] N. Metropolis, A. W. Rosenbluth, M. N. Rosenbluth, A. H. Teller, and E. Teller. Equation of state calculations by fast computing machines. *The journal of chemical physics*, 21(6):1087-1092. 1953.

[22] S. P. Meyn and R. L. Tweedie. *Markov chains and stochastic stability.* Springer Science and Business Media, 2012.

[23] T. Mikosch. Regular variation, subexponentiality and their applications in probability theory. Eindhoven University of Technology, 1999.

[24] R. B. Nelsen. *An introduction to copulas*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.

[25] E. Nummelin. MC's for MCMC'ists. *International Statistical Review*, 70:215-240, 2002.

[26] E. Nummelin. *General irreducible Markov chains and non-negative operators*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.

[27] S. I. Resnick. *Extreme values, regular variation and point processes*. Springer, 2013.

[28] G. O. Roberts and J. S. Rosenthal. General state space Markov chains and MCMC algorithms. *Probability Surveys*, 1:20-71, 2004.

[29] J. S. Rosenthal. Minorization conditions and convergence rates for Markov chain Monte Carlo. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 90(430):558-566, 1995.

[30] R. Schmidt. Tail dependence for elliptically contoured distributions. *Mathematical Methods of Operations Research*, 55(2):301-327, 2002.

[31] B. W. Silverman. *Density Estimation*. Chapman & Hall, London, 1986.

[32] D. Tasche. Risk contributions and performance measurement. Working paper, Techische Universität Münichen, 1999.

[33] D. Tasche. Conditional expectation as quantile derivative. *arXiv preprint math/0104190*, 2001.

[34] D. Tasche. Capital Allocation with CreditRisk+. In V. M. Gundlach and F. B. Lehrbass, editors, *CreditRisk+ in the Banking Industry*, 25-44. Springer, 2004.

[35] D. Tasche and L. Tibiletti. Approximations for the Value-at-Risk approach to risk-return analysis. *The ICFAI Journal of Financial Risk Management*, 1(4):44-61, 2004.

[36] D. Tasche. Capital allocation to business units and sub-portfolios: the Euler principle. In *Pillar II in the New Basel Accord: The Challenge of Economic Capital* (ed. A. Resti), 423-453. London: Risk Books, 2008.

[37] D. Tasche. Capital allocation for credit portfolios with kernel estimators. *Quantitative Finance*, 9(5):581-595, 2009.

[38] L. Tierney. Markov chains for exploring posterior distributions. *the Annals of Statistics*, 1701-1728, 1994.

[39] D. Vats, J. M. Flegal, and G. L. Jones. Multivariate output analysis for Markov chain Monte Carlo. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1512.07713*, 2015.

[40] Y. Yamai. and T. Yoshiba. Comparative analyses of expected shortfall and value-at-risk: their estimation error, decomposition, and optimization. *Monetary and economic studies*, 20(1):87-121, 2002.

[41] T. Yoshiba. Risk aggregation by a copula with a stressed condition. No. 13-E-12. Bank of Japan, 2013.